

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

**GUIDELINES FOR FINAL EVALUATION  
(Issued May 2000)**

**I. Overview of Evaluation**

The goal of USAID's Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (PVC) is to build the capability of U.S. PVOs to have a sustainable impact in their work in international development. With USAID's emphasis on managing for results, program evaluations have become less descriptive and more evidence-based. PVC has assisted PVOs to strengthen their program monitoring and to document program achievements so that PVO's can provide credible evidence of achievements and results.

PVC is committed to documenting the capacity building effects of its grants. Although capacity building objectives were not part of the DIP guidelines for this program cycle, capacity building effects are inevitable, and greater emphasis is being placed on documenting these achievements at both the field program site and the PVO headquarters level.

**A. Core Evaluation Practices**

PVC's evaluation policies reflect a commitment to a set of core evaluation practices that over the years have proved to be critical elements in building PVO capacity to monitor and evaluate field programs. These practices have emerged from the lessons learned from the programs implemented by our PVO partners.

- 1. Evaluations are joint activities.** Truly effective learning experiences involve all the partners. PVC, the PVOs, their local partners, and other stakeholders

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

usually participate in program evaluations. The participatory nature of the evaluation process encourages problem analysis and development of solutions by project staff and partners.

**2. Good program design** is the foundation for documenting achievements.

Programs that have successfully documented their achievements have clearly stated objectives, valid indicators and a realistic method for measuring change over the life of the program. The establishment of accurate baseline data is a critical element in tracking change.

**3. Program commitment to the use of data.** The most successful programs demonstrate strong staff commitment to regular review of project performance data and action planning based on the data.

All good evaluations recognize the achievements of the project and staff and document innovative activities highlighting promising practices or new approaches.

**B. Purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems**

The BASICS publication, "Child Survival BASICS, Monitoring and Evaluation: Tools for Improving Child Health and Survival," (Quarterly Technical Newsletter #5, Spring 1998), defines monitoring and evaluation as "collecting and analyzing information that is accurate and reliable and can be put to practical use".

- 1. Monitoring** involves plotting progress in meeting implementation goals or measuring outputs and process, while
- 2. Evaluation** takes a broader perspective, determining if the course is the best one --- or assessing overall outcome or impact.

**USAID/BHR/PVC**  
**PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM**  
**CS-XII, 1996-2000**

In the PVO Child Survival Program, monitoring and evaluation provide program managers, local partners and USAID with: a clear understanding of how the PVO program is functioning; evidence of results that have been achieved, and the importance of these achievements to the design and implementation of future programs. The DIP describes the monitoring system the PVO intends to use. The evaluations take place at the program mid-term and end, and differ from each other in focus, and in the kinds of information they provide:

**3. The mid-term evaluation** focuses on the process of program implementation. The evaluation uses data and information from the program's monitoring system to (a) assess progress in implementing the DIP; (b) assess progress towards achievement of objectives or yearly benchmarks; (c) assess if interventions are sufficient to reach desired outcomes, (d) identify barriers to achievement of objectives, and (e) to provide recommended actions to guide the program staff through the last half of the program.

**4. The final evaluation** is focused on (a) assessing if the program met the stated goals and objectives; (b) the effectiveness of the technical approach; (c) development of the overarching lessons learned from the project, and (d) a strategy for use or communication of these lessons both within the organization and to partners.

**C. The Evaluation Audience**

The possible "audiences" for the information from the program evaluations include the local partners, the PVO, USAID PVC and Missions and other stakeholders.

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

However, while PVC and its partners share similar evaluation objectives, the information needs of each partner are different.

While the Child Survival Division monitors the performance of the individual programs, the Division also must consolidate information across all programs to report to senior level Agency managers and congressional interest groups about the effectiveness of the PVO child survival programs. Results reporting by BHR/PVC is intimately linked to resource allocation and thus clearly presented program results, with supporting evidence, are key to continued funding of the PVO Child Survival Grants Program.

Throughout these Guidelines text boxes like this one identify PVC's information needs. These questions are linked to PVC's strategic plan and indicators. It is important that these questions are incorporated in the evaluation SOW and that responses appear in the evaluation report.

#### **D. The Evaluation Process**

- 1. Participation:** BHR/PVC encourages the participation of PVO headquarters and field program staff, representatives from project partners, government health service personnel and community members in planning and conducting the evaluation. Representatives from other PVOs, USAID Mission staff, and other stakeholders (including CAs) may be invited.
- 2. Developing the SOW:** The PVO is responsible for developing the Statement of Work (SOW) for the evaluation team. While these Evaluation Guidelines identify a core set of components to be addressed, the PVO tailors the evaluation to its needs with questions that are specific to the program. The

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

information needs and evaluation questions of the primary partners should also be integrated into the evaluation SOW. BHR/PVC does not need to approve the evaluation SOW.

3. **Team Composition:** The evaluation Team Leader, who serves as the lead author and editor of the evaluation report, should be someone who is not employed by, or otherwise professionally associated with the concerned PVO or the specific child survival program. The PVO identifies a candidate for the Team leader and proposes this to BHR/PVC for approval prior to the evaluation. The CORE Group, CSTS and several PVOs have developed databases of good, proven evaluators of PVO Child Survival programs. If you have identified another good one, please add this person's name to their lists! Additional team members may include others that the PVO selects from the PVO, its partners, and other organizations.

## **II. The Final Evaluation Report**

The final evaluation provides an opportunity for all program stakeholders to take stock of accomplishments to date and to listen to the beneficiaries at all levels: including mothers, other community members and opinion leaders, health workers, health system administrators, local partners, other organizations and donors. The final evaluation includes the comparison of baseline and final data, elaborates on the lessons learned from the model or implementation approach, and identifies promising practices and opportunities for scaling up and/or replicating the approach within a broader context. The final evaluation provides an additional opportunity for the program to benefit from the outside viewpoint of a consultant who acts as facilitator of the evaluation process. Other PVOs and resource persons may also be invited to participate in the evaluation process.

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

The final evaluation report shall address each of the following elements. If any of these items is not covered by the evaluation, please explain why. Except for the summary, redundant sections may be cross-referenced.

**A. Summary**

Provide a one-to-two page executive summary of the report that includes:

1. Brief description of the program and its objectives.
2. The main accomplishments of the program.
3. Highlights from the comparison of the baseline and final evaluation surveys.
4. A list of the priority conclusions resulting from this evaluation.

**B. Assessment of Results and Impact of the Program**

The Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP), presented in the first year of the program is the official workplan of the program. The outline below provides guidance for the evaluation team for examining the program's technical child survival interventions, and for the approaches that cut across those technical interventions.

**1. Results: Summary Chart**

Construct a chart containing baseline and final data for all of the program objectives/indicators

**2. Results: Technical Approach**

- a. Provide a brief overview of the project --- objectives, location, intervention mix, general program strategy. More detailed documentation may be provided in the annexes.

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

- b. Progress report by intervention area. In this section:
- (i) Discuss the results of the program as measured by comparison of the baseline and final evaluation survey.
  - (ii) Describe factors affecting achievement of program objectives.
  - (iii) For objectives not fully achieved, discuss contributing factors.
  - (iv) For each intervention, what are the main lessons learned?
  - (v) Discuss special outcomes, and unexpected successes or constraints.
  - (vi) If the program is continuing, describe how will the lessons learned be applied to future activities.
- c. Discuss any new tools or approaches that the program developed or used; operations research or special studies that were conducted; how the data/information have been used and what actions were taken.

**3. Results: Cross-cutting approaches (address each section applicable)**

This section discusses progress on approaches that cross intervention areas and have, or will impact on project objectives. These are activities that may or may not have been articulated specifically in the DIP, but have emerged as critical activities in the program. In discussing cross-cutting activities, discuss the impact of the activities on the program.

Examples of cross-cutting approaches include behavior-change strategies, community mobilization, partnership-building activities and training (e.g. negotiations, agreements achieved, linkages formed), outreach strategies,

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

advocacy or community or awareness-building strategies, and strengthening information management systems. The evaluation team may discuss any other cross-cutting activities that may be pertinent to the program. Also include modifications and explanations/rationale for those modifications, and cross-cutting activities added to the work plan.

Discuss progress made in relation to objectives and targets, methods and approaches used, timing, key participants, geographical scope of activity, technical areas covered, etc. Describe how activities have had/will have:

- An effect or impact on the program.
- An impact on the lessons learned to date.
- Links to future activities.

The following are specific questions for several cross-cutting approaches.

**a. Community Mobilization**

- (i) How effective was the approach for community mobilization?
- (ii) Were the objectives met for community mobilization?
- (iii) What lessons were learned for future community mobilization efforts?
- (iv) Is there demand in the community for program activities to continue? How was this measured?
- (v) What are the plans for sustaining these activities once the program closes?
- (vi) Are the sustainability plans realistic?



**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

**b. Communication for Behavior Change**

- (i) How effective was the approach for communication and behavior change?
- (ii) Were the behavior change objectives met?
- (iii) What were the lessons learned?
- (iv) How will these behaviors be sustained once the program closes?
- (v) Are the sustainability plans realistic?

**c. Capacity Building Approach**

Discuss the capacity strengthening results of this program. This may include how the program improved the capacity of the PVO, the public sector partners, NGOs and/or community-based partners. Use the questions below to guide your assessment.

(i) Strengthening the PVO Organization

- The external reviewer and the PVO will assess the capacity building effects this program had on the overall organization – U.S.-based headquarters as well as field operations. This may require a visit by the external reviewer to the PVO headquarters.
- How has this grant improved the capacity of the PVO to design, implement and evaluate effective child survival programs?
- Have effects of this grant influenced other programs operated by the PVO?

(ii) Strengthening Local Partner Organizations

- Discuss organizational capacity building efforts with the local partners.
- Describe the outcomes of any assessment, formal or informal, conducted at the outset of the program to determine the organizational capacities of local

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

partners. (These were not required under CS XII, but may have been performed.)

- How have the organizational capacities of the local partner changed since the beginning of the program? What factors/interventions have most contributed to those changes?
- What are the lessons learned in capacity building of local partners?

(iii) Health Facilities Strengthening

- How effective was the approach for improved management and services at health facilities?
- What tools did the program use for health facility assessments? Were the tools effective for measuring change?
- What were the lessons learned?
- What are the plans for sustaining these activities once the program closes? Are the sustainability plans realistic?
- Discuss linkages between these facilities and the communities.

(iv) Strengthening Health Worker Performance

- How effective was the approach for strengthening health worker performance?
- Were the performance objectives met?
- What were the lessons learned?
- What are the plans for sustaining health worker performance once the program closes?
- Are the sustainability plans realistic?
- Were the tools used to assess the results of improving health worker performance sensitive enough to measure change over the life of the program?

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

- Did the program address the gaps between performance standards and actual performance?

(v) Training

- How effective was the training strategy?
- Were the training objectives met?
- What evidence is there that suggests that the training implemented has resulted in new ways of doing things, or increased knowledge and skills of the participants?
- What were the lessons learned?
- What are the plans for sustaining these training activities once the program closes?
- Are the sustainability plans for training realistic?

**d. Sustainability Strategy**

- Were the sustainability goals and objectives that were articulated in the DIP met?
- What is the status of the phase-over plan, and is it on schedule? After the program, will there be any continuing technical and management assistance?
- Have the approaches to building financial sustainability-- (e.g., local level financing, cost recovery, resource diversification, corporate sponsorships) been successful?
- How has the program built demand for services, and is the community sufficiently engaged to influence how services are delivered?

**C. Program Management**

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

This section provides an overall discussion of program management issues, at HQ, within the field program, with partners and with the community. The objective is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the management support systems, i.e., planning, financial management, information management, personnel management, supervision, training, logistics, etc. The aim is to identify specific ways in which the management support systems contributed to or hindered program implementation.

**1. Planning**

- a. How inclusive was the program planning process and what effect did this have on the implementation process?
- b. To what extent was the DIP work plan practical? Based on the PVO and its partner's experience with this program, what could be added to the DIP preparation and review process that would have strengthened implementation?
- c. What were the gaps in the DIP and how were they addressed by the program staff?

**2. Staff Training**

- a. What change is there in the knowledge, skills and competencies of the program and partner's staff? Is there evidence that the staff has applied these skills both within the program and in another context?
- b. Were adequate resources dedicated to staff training?
- c. What are the overall lessons learned about building the capacity of program staff?

**3. Supervision of Program Staff**

- a. Was the supervisory system adequate?

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

- b. Is the supervisory system fully institutionalized and can it be maintained?
- c. Is there evidence that the program's approach to strengthening supervisory systems has been adopted beyond the program?

**4. Human Resources and Staff Management**

- a. Are essential personnel policies and procedures in place to continue program operations that are intended to be sustainable?
- b. Describe the morale, cohesion and working relationships of program personnel and how this affected program implementation.
- c. Describe the level of staff turnover throughout the life of the program, and the impact it has had on program implementation.
- d. Have plans been developed to facilitate staff transition to other paying jobs at the end of the program?

**5. Financial Management** [to be completed with the field staff and lead evaluator]

- a. Discuss the adequacy of the PVO's and partners' financial management and accountability for program finances and budgeting. If the project budget was adjusted, explain why. Do the program implementers have adequate budgeting skills to be able to accurately estimate costs and elaborate on budgets for future programming?
- b. Are adequate resources in place to finance operations and activities that are intended to be sustained beyond this cooperative agreement?
- c. Was there sufficient outside technical assistance available to assist the grantee and its partners to develop financial plans for sustainability?

**6. Logistics**

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

- a. What impact has logistics (procurement and distribution of equipment, supplies, vehicles, etc.) had on the implementation of the program?
- b. Is the logistics system sufficiently strong to support operations and activities that are intended to be sustained?

**7. Information Management**

- How effective was the system to measure progress towards program objectives?
- Was there a systematic way of collecting, reporting and using data at all program levels? Cite examples of how program data was used to make management or technical decisions.
- Is the program staff sufficiently skilled to continue collecting program data/information and to use it for program revisions or strengthening?
- Did the program conduct or use special assessments, mini survey focus groups, etc. to solve problems or test new approaches? Give examples of the research, use of data, and outcomes.

- a. To what extent did the program strengthen other existing data collection systems (i.e. government)?
- b. Do the program staff, headquarters staff, local level partners, and the community have a clear understanding of what the program has achieved?
- c. How have the program's monitoring and impact data been used beyond this child survival program?

**8. Technical and Administrative Support**

- a. Discuss types and sources, timeliness, and utility of external technical assistance the program has received to date.

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

- b. What assistance did the program need that was not available? How could PVO headquarters and/or USAID better plan for the technical assistance needs of PVO programs?
- c. Discuss PVO headquarters and regional technical and managerial support of the field program. Approximately how much time has been devoted to supporting this program?

**9. Management Lessons Learned**

List the overall management lessons learned.

**D. Other Issues Identified by the Team**

Discuss additional issues identified by the team during the course of the evaluation.

**E. Conclusions and Recommendations**

This section presents the main conclusions based on this final evaluation.

- 1. Based on the data from the baseline and final assessments, presented in the summary chart, discuss whether the objectives were met, and your conclusions regarding the success of the program in meeting its objectives.
- 2. Describe the most important achievements, constraints and other factors affecting program performance.
- 3. Outline the lessons learned.
- 4. Present any recommendations for USAID/BHR/PVC, the program staff and collaborating partners regarding future work or directions.

**USAID/BHR/PVC  
PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM  
CS-XII, 1996-2000**

PVO headquarters should present a short section on how they intend to use the lessons learned and communicate this information to the broader development community.

**F. Results Highlight**

**One page “results highlight” [Tear-out sheet]**

If appropriate, provide a one-page description of some element of the program, with supporting data, that would make a good stand-alone communication piece for the PVO or USAID to distribute or to post on the Office WebPage. This might be an aspect of the program that was particularly successful and deserves further documentation.

**III. ATTACHMENTS:**

**A. Team members and their titles**

**B. Assessment methodology**

Provide a brief discussion of the assessment methods used by the final evaluation team to assess essential knowledge, skills, practices, and supplies of health workers and facilities associated with the program.

**C. List of persons interviewed and contacted**

**D. Diskette with electronic copy of the report in MS WORD**

**E. Special reports**

If appropriate, include special reports or analyses produced by the program.